

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- x
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

- against -

GARY T. GLANZ, DIANE GLANZ and
SUFFOLK COUNTRY,

Defendant.
----- x

ANSWER

Jury Trial Demanded

Case No: 2:14-cv-6502 (JS) (ARL)

Defendants Gary T. Glanz and Diane Glanz, by their attorney Richard Paul Stone, allege as follows as their answer to the complaint filed November 4, 2014 (the "Complaint"), upon information and belief.

1. The Glanz defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph 1 of the Complaint
2. The Glanz defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
3. The Glanz defendants deny the allegations set forth in paragraph 3 of the Complaint and refer this court to the official records of defendant Suffolk Country and this court legal conclusion as to the nature and parameters of the real property and improvements known as 24 Shore Road, Southampton NY 11968 (the "Property").
4. The Glanz defendants admit the allegations set forth in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
5. The Glanz defendants admit the allegation set forth in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
6. The Glanz defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation set forth in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
7. The Glanz defendants repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth in response to paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 8 of the Complaint but admit that a lien exists, dated March 12, 2004, which improperly named defendant as “tax payer” for obligations of Electronic Funds & Data Corporation (“EFDC”).

9. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 3 of the Complaint but admit plaintiff’s agent gave notice of assessments to EFDC.

10. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 10 of the Complaint but admit plaintiff’s agents gave notice of assessments to EFDC.

11. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. The Glanz defendants repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth in response to paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 14 of the Complaint in the form alleged but admit that defendant Gary T. Glanz transferred his interest in the Property to his wife Diane Glanz (the “Transfer”).

15. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 15 of the Complaint in the form alleged but admit that a deed exists for the Transfer and they leave the legal meaning of that document for determination by this court.

16. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 16 of the Complaint in the form alleged but admit that a deed exists for the Transfer and they leave the legal meaning of that document for determination by this court.

17. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

19. The Glanz defendants deny each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

WHEREFORE, the Glanz defendants demand judgment dismissing the action. Defendants demand a trial by jury.

Dated: New York, New York
December 8, 2014

Richard Paul Stone, Esq.



(RS 3368)

14 Penn Plaza - Suite 1807
225 West 34th Street
New York, New York 10122
Telephone 516.642.1987
e-mail rps@stonecounsel.com

To: Alan Shapiro, Esq.
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Tax Division
P.O. Box 55, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
(202) 307-6503
e-mail alan.m.shapiro@usdoj.gov